DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 465 357 HE 035 007

AUTHOR Aleman, Ana M. Martinez; Salkever, Katya
TITLE Multiculturalism and the Liberal Arts College: Faculty Perceptions of Pedagogy.
PUB DATE 2002-00-00
NOTE 53p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Cultural Activities; Educational Philosophy; Higher Education; *Liberal Arts; *Multicultural Education; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This is a qualitative study of faculty perceptions of the relationship between pedagogy, liberal education, and multiculturalism. The incompatibility of liberal education and multiculturalism ground this study along with the assertion that teaching and learning are central to the liberal education mission. Nineteen faculty members participated in interviews. The findings suggest that the lack of coherence between institutional mission and multiculturalism, the absence of agreement of faculty and administration on the role of multiculturalism in liberal education, and a variety of epistemological positions characterize faculty views of teaching and learning at a liberal arts college struggling to attain pluralistic community. The interview protocol is attached. (Contains 17 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 465 357

Multiculturalism and the Liberal Arts College: Faculty Perceptions of Pedagogy

by

Dr Ana M. Martínez Alemán & Katya Salkever, Doctoral Candidate
Boston College
Lynch School of Education
Campion 222
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467
617-552-1760
alemanan@bc.edu

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Martinez
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE035007

Multiculturalism and the Liberal Arts College: Faculty Perceptions of Pedagogy

A qualitative study of faculty perceptions of the relationship between pedagogy, liberal education and multiculturalism.

Abstract

The incompatibility of liberal education and multiculturalism ground this qualitative study. Given this assertion and that teaching and learning is central to the liberal educational mission, we explore faculty perceptions of the relationship between multiculturalism and liberal educational pedagogy. The findings of this study suggest that the lack of coherence between institutional mission and multiculturalism, the absence of agreement of faculty and administration on the role of multiculturalism in liberal education, and the variety of epistemological positions characterize faculty views of teaching and learning at a liberal arts college struggling to attain pluralistic community.

Introduction

In 1995 Berkeley sociologist Troy Duster astutely observed that American higher education was in the midst of a "raging national controversy" that centered on "multiculturalism". Duster noted that on his particular campus, "multiculturalism" was alleged responsible for the fragmentation of the campus community (Duster, 1995). Others like Ernest Boyer (1993) echoed the sentiment. Throughout the latter decades of the 20th century and into our post-affirmative action era of the early 21st century, the increasing racial and ethnic diversity on colleges and universities has prompted much commentary on the state of American higher learning.

In particular, many scholars and philanthropic foundations have deliberated on the value of liberal education for America's growing pluralism. Higher education reformers have looked to the liberal arts colleges to serve as models of effective pluralistic campus communities. Scholars such as Martha Nussbaum (1997) have argued that the qualities and character of liberal education and liberal thinking make it uniquely able meet the needs of an increasingly diverse campus. Together with Nussbaum, scholars like William Cronon (1999), Reed College president Steven Koblick (1999), and Frank F. Wong (1996) assert that a reformulated liberal education, one that is "more democratic, more multicultural, and more responsive to the needs of American society" (Wong, 1996, p. 75), can effectively address pluralism's challenges on the college campus.

Whether reformulated or reformed, Martínez Alemán (2001) has challenged the assertion that liberal education can effectively address the challenges brought by multicultural forces. Martínez Alemán asserts that "the communitarian ideal of today's colleges and undergraduate university programs appears at odds with the post-modern

demands of multiculturalism" (2001, p. 486). Using John Dewey's pragmatism Martínez Alemán theorizes a "relevant and effective understanding of collegiate community" in which "universality and difference would alter and transform each other, serving to promote the growth of the community" (p.485). This "Deweyan multiculturalism" is a "method of thinking" that challenges the "tradition of exclusion, cultural insularity, and intellectual reticence" (p. 500) that makes community unattainable on liberal educational campuses. As Martínez Alemán summarizes

> The college community 'enforced' has been one in which the challenges of pluralistic identification, whether in scholarship, pedagogy, or in the extra-curriculum, have been understood as dangerous and deleterious to liberal learning. But as my reading of Dewey has suggested, this challenge to liberal learning is a false one, or at least one of paradigmatic error. The pluralistic claims of individuals, in fact, bring to liberal learning a means for understanding and negotiating life on campus. These historically politicized identities challenge the college to grow, to expand its intelligence, to seek commonality not in the falsehood of assimilative pluralism but in the reality of experiential difference. If American higher education is to become Dewey's "great community" it must distance itself from the liberal view that dissolving difference is the means to a community of individuals with shared values and objectives. It must recognize that the fact of difference is necessary for the realization of community. (p. 500)

Martínez Alemán's "Deweyan multiculturalism" is an epistemology of difference and it is this epistemology of difference that guided researchers to assess the value of Deweyan multiculturalism for America's liberal arts colleges. Martínez Alemán

& Salkever (2001) explored how residents of liberal arts colleges understand the mission of liberal education and its relationship to the college's ambitions for multicultural community. These researchers found that the liberal arts colleges studied "remain fundamentally tied to liberal ideas about community and difference", suggesting that these colleges are anchored to an epistemology of difference in which difference or multiculturalism is not a means of thinking but its aim (p. 132). Martínez Alemán & Salkever (In press) in their subsequent study explored how faculty, administrators and students at a liberal arts college understand the mission of liberal education and its relationship to multiculturalism. Their data suggests that the liberal educational mission of this college thwarts the development of multicultural communal aims. They conclude that the lack of institutional coherence between mission and multicultural goals will frustrate institutional diversity programs and projects.

This study expands the investigation to pedagogy. Given that teaching and learning is central to the liberal educational mission, in this study, we explore faculty perceptions of the relationship between multiculturalism and liberal educational pedagogy. Faculty at Belden College (a pseudonym) were asked to reflect on this relationship, a relationship that takes into account the liberal curriculum and instructional methods[1].

Literature Review

The research literature on teaching and learning in higher education is both wide-ranging and multifaceted. This literature contains empirical research studies, an extensive collection of reflections of academics on their practice, critiques of pedagogical

[1] The assessment of the relationship between liberal curricular change and multiculturalism at this college is included in a larger study (Salkever, 2002).

traditions in the academy, policy analyses and assessment strategies. But from such classic prescriptions as Cardinal Newman's The Uses of the University (1999/1852) and Alfred North Whitehead's The Aims of Education (1929) to modern proposals like Chickering and Gamson's "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" (1987) or critiques like Maher and Tetreault's The Feminist Classroom (1994) and Angelo and Cross' classroom assessment scholarship (1988), scholarly observations of teaching and learning in higher education largely endeavor to comment whether explicitly or implicitly on the nature of knowledge, the nature of the teacher and the nature of the learner. From this vast literature we focus our review on that which more directly relates to our investigation.

Teaching and Learning in Higher Education

Much of the literature on teaching and learning in American higher education is incorporated into a larger research agenda that seeks to understand and isolate the effect college has on students. Whether focusing on developmental or cognitive measures, this body of research contains data on students' cognitive, moral, and psychological development and the effects of instructors and instruction on students. These studies have been compiled and catalogued in Feldman and Newcomb (1969) and Pascarella and Terenzini (1991). Astin's (1993) What Matters in College: Four Critical Years Revisited summarizes the scholarship that considers a variety of cognitive and affective student outcomes measures, while McKeachie, et al (1986) abridge the research findings on the effects of faculty-student and student-student contact on teaching and learning. Studies on the effects of faculty-student contact consider such things as student evaluation of teaching (Krautman & Sander, 1999; Feldman, 1994), student-faculty contact outside the

classroom (Pascarella, 1980), and teacher behaviors (Feldman, 1989). Recently scholars have attempted to study the relationship between student race/ethnicity and learning (Anderson, 1988; Jenkins & Bainer, 1991).

Research on teaching and learning in liberal arts college is mainly found in the literature on the value of liberal education and its emphasis on teaching. Studies on student development often cite liberal education as important for student development (Astin, 1984, 1993; Boyer, 1990). Other scholarship focuses on the development of critical thinking skills in liberal education (Davies, 1994; Hersh, 1997; Tsui, 1999). The importance and worth of the liberal arts college is often the topic of academic reflections (Teaching What We Do, 1991; Distinctively American: The Residential Liberal Arts Colleges, 1999) while studies of particular institutions (Clark, 1992) underscore their unique place and role in American higher education. Recent endeavors have attempted to ascertain the effectiveness of liberal education for pluralism (e. g. Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1999, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c; American Council on Education, 2000).

Student learning at liberal arts colleges is conceptualized not unlike it is at most other institutions. As Stage, et al (1998) assert in their review of learning theory and the learning-centered classroom, colleges and universities in the U. S. continue to base instruction on Kolb's (1976) stage theory of learning. Kolb's theory stipulates that pedagogy can be attributed to faculty learning style, suggesting that in order for learning to occur student and faculty styles must match. Thus, attempts to change instructional practices often involve a consideration of the "learning styles" of students and their correlation with disciplinary pedagogical traditions. For example, mathematics

instruction, historically geared towards memorization, in some institutions now reflects a shift toward student-centered interactive pedagogy (Wagener, 1991).

The attention to "learning style" in the research literature suggests a desire to understand learning as a consequence of either an inherent cognitive ability in students or as environmental/pedagogical factors or both. Scholarship on learning styles and learning styles inventories such as the Perceptual Learning Style (PSLP) and Style Analysis Survey (SAS) reflect a belief that cognitive skills are not universal and collegiate instruction should account for the differences (Sims & Sims, 1995). However, researchers have struggled with defining and assessing the implications of differing approaches to learning styles among students (Claxton & Murrell, 1987).

The idea that cognitive skills vary across students is anchored in early 20th century motivation and drive theory. Attribution research like Heider's (1958) and Bandura's (1986) self-efficacy theory attempt to understand learning behaviors as products of internal or "natural" conditions of individuals and/or external or "environmental" effects. Thus, in our consideration of the relationship between multiculturalism and pedagogy at a liberal arts college, it was not surprising to find that faculty often spoke about their teaching and student learning in these ways. In particular, there was an adherence to the belief that ethnicity and race as "natural" or essential conditions correlate directly with learning styles. A review of the research literature on the relationship of race/ethnicity to learning affirms these faculty perceptions, or minimally supports their view that race and ethnicity are critical factors in learning and as such must affect instructional methods (Anderson, 1988; Banks, 1994; Longstreet, 1994; Decker, 1983; Hillard, 1989; Willis, 1989).

Disciplinary Differences and Pedagogy

One of the great dividing factors in reaching a common faculty understanding of what counts as knowledge and what makes effective teaching and fruitful learning is disciplinary norms and perspectives. The prominent question that has been the source of research over the last twenty-five years is how disciplinary differences impact faculty and students values and experiences in the teaching and learning process. This question is particularly pertinent in an examination of multicultural change and pedagogy as disciplinary outlooks and limitations are often held up as major obstacles to effective widespread multicultural curricular and pedagogical change. From the research, two dominant sentiments on disciplinary differences emerge.

First, some researchers have found that disciplinary differences have a profound impact on teaching, learning, and pedagogical decision-making. In his study of learning styles and disciplinary difference, Kolb (1998) found the perception that,

> the disciplines incline to different styles of learning is evident from the variations among their primary tasks, technologies and products, criteria for academic excellence and productivity, teaching methods, research methods, and methods for recording and portraying knowledge. (p. 128)

These findings were supported by conclusions drawn by Franklin & Theall (1992) that found disciplinary influence in faculty's understanding of knowledge and pedagogical classroom decision-making. When examined in the context of liberal arts colleges, Stark & Morstain (1978) found similar results which demonstrated, "liberal arts college faculty are not homogeneous in their views of educational purpose and process; in fact, their views are generally related to their disciplinary affiliations"(p.433). These views resulting

from disciplinary affiliation then play a prominent role in individual professors', departments', and divisions' receptivity to pedagogical change. The disciplinary educational values "help direct...the extent to which faculty allow contextual factors to modify their goals (Eljamal, Sharp, Stark, Arnold, & Lowther, 1998, p. 120) and this goal modification and acknowledgement of contextual factors is central to faculty's interpretation and implementation of multicultural change in pedagogy.

The second, more limited perspective that comes out of the research on disciplinary differences suggests that disciplinary position and influence has little role in the definition of positive teaching and learning. Murray and Renaud (1998) purported,

> despite differences among academic fields in the frequency of occurrence of specific teaching behaviors, the contribution of these same behaviors to overall teaching effectiveness seems to be very similar in different academic fields. (p. 304)

They went on to state, "contrary to current popular view...what makes an effective teacher, at least in the eyes of students, is pretty much the same regardless of academic discipline"(p. 304). This research varies dramatically from other studies, but much of this difference could be attributed to a greater focus on the student rather than the faculty perspective on the pedagogical experience.

However, amongst faculty it is clear that a perception of disciplinary differences exists that can lead to divisiveness and difficulty when trying to address multiculturalism and pedagogy at an institutional level. Smart and Ethington (1995) encourage faculty and administrators to recognize but not be immobilized by disciplinary differences. They suggest, "the challenge is...to accept the entrenched nature of existing goals and to focus

their energies and resources on assisting faculty to improve their instructional effectiveness, which ultimately will benefit student learning (p.55)". For the case of multiculturalism and pedagogy similar advice may hold true. When attempting to address multiculturalism and pedagogy across disciplines and departments, it may be best work with faculty to envision pedagogical changes within their disciplinary.

The Liberal Arts College and Multicultural Curricular Change

Multicultural curricular change in the small liberal arts college began in many institutions as efforts to include in the curriculum previously ignored or under-studied cultures. These efforts were anticipated "to transform curricula to correct past exclusions, better prepare students for increasingly complex and diverse communities and workplaces; and to provide students with the most current and intellectually comprehensive understanding of history, culture and society" (Humphreys & Schneider, 1997, p. 1). Additionally, through attention to diversifying the curriculum institutions attempted to establish their dedication to multiculturalism in the institution (Humphreys, 1997). Organizations like the Association of American Colleges and Universities, The Fund for Improving Post Secondary Education (FIPSE), Lilly Foundation, Mellon Foundation, Mott Foundation, Hewlett Foundation, the Kellogg Foundation, Philip Morris Companies and others, bolstered individual institutions' efforts by providing funding for multicultural course development, faculty development, and opportunities for pursuit of student multicultural interest (Haworth & Conrad, 1995; Smith, 1997). With the assistance of this funding institutions began to introduce curricular reform on individual course, departmental and broad curricular levels.

However, given the small liberal arts college's historic curricular centering on the Western canon and classical studies, multicultural curricular change has been arduous. Any curricular change for the liberal arts college is examined thoroughly, critically, and often suspiciously by those who believe in the founding traditions and missions of the institutions (Carnochan, 1993). Additionally, because curricular governance rests almost solely in the hands of the faculty, multicultural curricular change is a slow process and a difficult one for faculty to agree on (Botstein, 1996).

In those times when faculty do come to agreement on curricular change or the work of individuals accomplishes change despite faculty resistance, opposition claims still abound expressing dismay that the inclusion of untested new "knowledge" may adulterate the ideals of liberal education and bow to the whims of politics. Additionally, any administratively led, sanctioned or even encouraged multicultural curricular change projects are questioned because these "curriculum change projects risk floundering because good intentions especially among administrators who want to sponsor programs that will be perceived as a political, are substituted for the expertise of [knowledgeable professors]" (Schuster & Van Dyne, 1984, p.542).

Yet despite these restrictions, multicultural curricular reform at small liberal arts college is not impossible. Largely through the influence of dedicated individuals, changing emphases and training in graduate school, and institutional mission and priority, curricular change can and has happened. And when faculty do enact multicultural curricular change, they are potentially initiating dialogue, stretching the limits of traditional disciplinary acceptance, and demonstrating their understanding of what counts as knowledge to students, the institution and the community (Gumport, 1988).

Administrative Policy and Leadership

Administration can play a crucial and powerful role in fostering multicultural change at an institution. The projection an administration makes on the priority and urgency of attention to diversity and multicultural issues can have a profound impact on the entire community. Alexander Astin (1993) found that overall satisfaction of students with the college experience was directly tied to the perceived institutional commitment to diversity. The perception of this commitment might come as a result of policies and programs promoting multiculturalism.

Policy and funding protocol for individual professor's curricular and pedagogical reforms and revision can be an avenue of administrative influence. By providing pools of money as multicultural incentives, administrations can encourage faculty to address multiculturalism in their individual classrooms and syllabi. Hunt, Bell, Wei and Engel (1992) feel a reward system is highly beneficial for multicultural change by faculty. This individual faculty approach has the potential to have a ripple effect where in more faculty and even departments can learn and change from the revisions made and questions asked by a few faculty. However, such approaches risk having a limited effect, influencing only those faculty who already have an interest in multiculturalism and missing those who feel it is not important or feel it has no place in their classroom.

Finally, administration can demonstrate commitment to multiculturalism and pedagogy through faculty development. Marchesani and Adams (1992) suggest a development model that integrates knowledge of professor and students along with course content and teaching method changes. Lebare and Lang (1992) cite the success of presidential-initiated faculty-wide development supported by the resources of standing

committees, extensive conferences, and existing studies of multicultural pedagogical success. Cooks supports the possibility of teaching faculty "culturally-relevant pedagogy"(p. 46). He believes faculty development should be used to help faculty reframe their thinking to encompass this culturally structured, sensitive and responsive approach. Yet despite these voices of support for institution-wide faculty development on multicultural pedagogy, such projects have the potential to meet significant resistance as the curriculum and the classroom have long been the realms of the faculty, not the administration. Any forced faculty development has the potential to be ineffective and to create further obstacles to any other multicultural administrative efforts.

A second approach to multiculturalism at the administrative level is including multiculturalism as a prominent and central part of the institutional mission statement. While often the wider community has input on the statement, ultimately, the president and other administrative leaders determine mission statement decisions. Bensimon (1995) found that a new diversity inclusive mission statement fostered the institution's shift towards a diverse institutional culture. Another way that diversity initiatives are furthered at the institutional level is through protocol on promotion and appointment of diverse individuals to leadership positions and tenured status (Bensimon, 1995). This might be manifested through appointing women and non-traditional individuals to presidential committees, visible campus organizations or most importantly in the top administrative ranks. Through this demonstrated support of non-traditional campus leaders and through the visibility of diverse ways of leadership, institutions address diversity on administrative and faculty levels. Humphreys (1997) suggests that connecting diversity issues to strategic planning and to college development and relations

demonstrates and integrates the centrality of diversity into the institutional vision. Finally, on the policy level, some diversity initiatives attempt to create links between multicultural communities outside the college itself, and the college community. Through longitudinal and multifaceted connection of these two communities, institutions can further their commitment to diversity through service, experiential opportunities, and mutual education.

Definition of Terms

Throughout this paper we will be using certain terms very specifically. In order to avoid confusion, we define these terms below:

1. "multiculturalism" or "Deweyan multiculturalism"- "That process or means of thinking that will enable us to communicate the socio-cultural facts of our past and present experiences in such a way as to expand knowledge and in doing so, modify experiential conditions". (Martínez Alemán, 2001, p. 496).
2. "diversity"- a term used by interview participants that encompasses all efforts and conditions at the college related to increasing the presence and visibility of all things related to race and ethnicity; primarily a reference to a numeric increase in persons of color or courses believed to have "diversity" content
3. "enumerative diversity"- a demographic condition determined by the presence of individuals of color (largely students and faculty) on a college campus (Martínez Alemán, 2001). This is sometimes referred to as "structural diversity" (Gurin, 1999).

4. "traditional academic programs"- academic programs which are based in the traditional, Western liberal arts and sciences, are not interdisciplinary, and have no pre-professional component.

Methodology

Belden College was established in the two prior stages of the research project as the in-depth case, and also serves as the focus of this study. Originally Belden was selected by Martínez Alemán & Salkever (2001) through purposive sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1984) as one of four elite small liberal arts colleges to be examined through an extensive document analysis. In the second stage of their study, Belden was chosen through intensity sampling (Patton, 1990) as an in depth-case for examining mission, multiculturalism and liberal education. For this study of pedagogy, multiculturalism and liberal education a continuation of the in-depth examination of Belden provided the most information-rich (Patton, 1990) scenario for research.

At Belden, we approached 41 individuals for participation in the project through introductory letters and e-mails. This correspondence put forth the intentions, design and the Human Subject requirements of the study. Among those solicited were senior faculty (tenured), junior faculty (untenured), former administrators and current academic affairs administrators. Of the 41 individuals approached, 19 agreed to participate in the project. The individuals represented all 3 academic divisions, and 11 different departments. Additionally two current administrators and two former administrators participated in the interviews. We interviewed all 19 participants over a six-day period on the Belden campus. Each interview was one-on-one and lasted approximately forty-five minutes to an hour (See Appendix A for sample protocol). All interviews were audio taped and later

transcribed. These transcriptions were then entered in HyperRESEARCH for coding and analysis.

We approached the establishment of the coding scheme through an emergent design in a process of "continuously interacting with and interpreting" the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, 102). Beginning with our grounding theory and then making "simple adjustment in the questions to be asked" (Lincoln & Guba, 102), we were able to establish a coding design that emerged as a result of our being "thoroughly steeped in the details of inquiry" (Lincoln, & Guba, 103).

Using the first three interviews to establish the coding framework and check it for consistency and scope, we then both jointly and separately coded the remaining interviews. The double coding (Boyatzis, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1984) allowed us to ensure reliability of the codes. We compared and discussed coding on a code by code basis as an internal interpretative check. Additionally, we annotated passages that we were unsure of and compiled a list of questions that were then reviewed, discussed and resolved. Through this analysis process we able to gather rich data that could be triangulated with findings from the previous two stages of the project. Once the coding was complete, we then examined all codes in order to group them into major findings. In this grouping process we kept notes on which participants to attribute the codes, what position they held, and the relative strength or weakness of the perception, either as a measure of the breadth of individuals who commented on the idea or the level of sentiment of the comments.

Findings

From this analysis five major themes emerged. These themes are (a) epistemology, (b) autonomy and authority, (c) learning style, (d) enumerative diversity, and (e) diversity as enterprise.

Epistemology

Unsurprisingly, faculty's perceptions about the relationship between multiculturalism and pedagogy are epistemological in nature. How faculty see the world and how their academic disciplinary affiliation affects their understanding of truth inform their reflections on the interrelationship between curriculum, pedagogy and multiculturalism. The derivations of knowledge, the content of knowledge, and its delivery to students are all epistemological issues that characterize the responses of faculty interviewed at Belden College. Faculty responses reveal intellectual disciplinary affiliations that typically signal epistemological positions. Whether faculty understood knowledge as a priori or a posteriori in origin, or as contextual and dependent on inter-subjectivity, the epistemological positions of the faculty lay bare their understanding of the value and relevance of multiculturalism to the liberal arts college.

We grouped the commentary that was epistemological in nature into two sub-themes: (a) Interdisciplinary programs as means for multiculturalism/"diversity" (b) Multiculturalism/ "Diversity" as a challenge to liberal education. We found a few exceptions to the viewpoints expressed in these two sub-themes and will discuss them at the end of the section.

Interdisciplinary programs, historically instituted include in Belden's liberal arts curriculum to epistemological differences brought to the academy by feminist, post-

modern, post-structural and critical scholarship, are viewed by many faculty as the "natural" home for curricular multiculturalism. As a metaphor for epistemological difference, the terms "natural" or "nature" are often invoked as rationalization for the place of multiculturalism in one traditional academic discipline or another suggesting a view of disciplinary subject matter as static, timeless and uncontested. Many faculty articulate a perception of multiculturalism as an epistemology that has no place in the empiricism or rationalism of their disciplines, a position that though not held by all the faculty interviewed, permeates the views of most participants, especially those not involved with the interdisciplinary programs on campus.

> I think that there are some courses in which it's naturally easier to challenge those cultural positions than other courses. And, I think that that's where you may well see a divide between say the sciences and the social sciences, for example. (Senior Science Faculty)
>
> With sociology, we have those concerns more naturally central to the concerns of the discipline than in some (of them). So it's just easy for us because it's right there in front of us to do.(Senior Social Sciences Faculty)
>
> I think there is no place where it couldn't be brought in with sufficient effort, but as you get further away from its natural habitat, it gets harder and harder. So I think in the Physics Department, for example, curricularly it's quite a stretch for us to bring [in multiculturalism]. (Senior Sciences Faculty)

Faculty who do teach courses in and across interdisciplinary programs are more likely to include multiculturalism in the description of their disciplinary training and focus, i.e. that the epistemology of difference is integral to how historians, psychologists,

sociologist, philosophers, etc, can and do view the world. These faculty for the most part, are generationally similar having completed their doctoral training in the last 10-15 years, an era in which the academic disciplines experienced a transformation the consequence of epistemological challenges (e. g. Bender & Schorske, 1997). These faculty speak of multiculturalism as a means to critically reflect on disciplinary knowledge and thus fundamentally consonant with the goals of liberal education. In a rare articulation of the relationship between pedagogy and multiculturalism, this junior faculty expresses the idea that "difference" is pedagogically important but that faculty must be open to that possibility:

> So, I think in terms of pedagogy, it's important for faculty to be able to hear difference and not to just simply -- not to know in advance what the difference is going to look like, but in fact, it could look like a serious challenge to something that you thought was pretty good. (Junior Humanities Faculty)

The academic generational correlation with an epistemology of difference is a thread woven throughout these interviews.

According to the faculty interviewed, interdisciplinary programs at Belden College are both an affirmation of the need for multiculturalism in the liberal educational curriculum and as the institutional home for multiculturalism/ "diversity" subject matter. Most faculty interviewed see interdisciplinary programs like women's/gender and ethnic studies programs as repositories for the college's multicultural/"diversity" curricular responsibilities. Faculty often speak of relegating alleged epistemological or disciplinary incompatibility to coursework outside the traditional disciplines. Faculty reason that the epistemological nature of traditional subject matter in their disciplines is either

incompatible or divergent to multicultural courses and as such had no real place in their departments.

Faculty make clear, however, that interdisciplinary programs do not have the same institutionally derived power as departments. Interdisciplinary programs at Belden do not hire their own faculty and must cobble programs together in coordination with the liberal arts and sciences departments. As a result, departmental hiring and staffing decisions and overall departmental commitment to interdisciplinary program objectives restrict interdisciplinary program offerings, according to faculty. Departmental resistance to "free-up" a faculty member to teach an interdisciplinary course that is not first a departmental offering can limit the breath of and reach of multiculturalism in Belden's curriculum. Faculty observe this phenomenon as both productively subversive and problematic. On the one hand, multiculturalism is being injected into the curriculum via interdisciplinary programs and within some departmental offerings. Then again, because full multicultural integration of the curriculum requires full departmental commitment (as in the case of Belden's Sociology Department), transformation will be slow and incremental at best. Faculty observe that because course content is the prerogative of the individual faculty and of the dictates of his or her department, only pervasive departmental personnel changes would dramatically improve the likelihood that departmental curricula will reflect an epistemology of difference now the distinction of interdisciplinary programs. This bears out in the case of the Sociology department at Belden whose departmental overhaul 20 years ago enabled the multicultural curricular transformation it exhibits today.

> In terms of the sociology department, when I first got here we were starting from scratch, another faculty member and me, taking over the department. And we established from the beginning a kind of international focus in our curriculum, which I think now we would consider multicultural. And that's been more or less true ever since. (Senior Social Sciences Faculty)

The epistemology of difference that is characteristic of multiculturalism is viewed by some faculty at Belden College as an acquiescence to socio-political forces impinging upon traditional liberal educational knowledge bases. According to some faculty interviewed, these forces bring to the traditional disciplines a relativism borne of the valuing of experiential difference that does not engender rigorous or critical thinking. Whether in the body of a student or a faculty member, multiculturalism/"diversity" to these faculty is equated with a decrease in academic quality for the sake of "political correctness" or to enact a moral good. These faculty report that the inculcation of multiculturalism/"diversity" into the liberal curriculum can be detrimental and "entails a price" (Senior Science faculty). The detriment and cost that is articulated is one of the loss of intellectual quality in faculty scholarship and in student learning. In effect, these faculty see multiculturalism/"diversity" as a political and not intellectual challenge and thus is without merit. These faculty generally support the racial and ethnic diversification of the faculty and the student body not because it they believe that it would critically improve the depth and breadth of the curriculum but because it's "the right thing to do" (Junior humanities faculty).

> I think so long as we view diversity as a value that is in competition with academic excellence -- and I think covertly, that is what we do, that we want to

> add diversity excellence rather than see diversity as integral to academic excellence. As long as diversity is viewed as a trade off, then we will get questions about [what counts as multiculturalism]. (Junior Humanities Faculty)

The faculty interviewed also perceive multiculturalism as a challenge to their liberal arts tradition in that the very nature of its epistemology--that difference is the means to critical thinking--would require faculty to make explicit the need to link subject matter with pedagogy, i. e. that they must make evident the relationship between what, why and how one teaches. According to these faculty multiculturalism demands that the relationship between epistemology, subject matter and method be exposed, a connection that traditional liberal educational practitioners often have ignored. Thus when gender, race or ethnicity is factored into the pedagogical equation, most faculty deduce that its effect will be a matter of the "learning style" of the student and not the epistemology of the discipline and its corresponding pedagogy.

There are two exceptions to these themes that warrant attention. One senior and one junior faculty do speak of the concurrence of liberal education with multiculturalism. These faculty members perceive multiculturalism as central to the liberal educational mission of the college because multiculturalism's epistemology of difference makes critical thinking possible for both students and faculty.

> But I think it also means a kind of reaffirmation of the notion that there are commonalities, even while or perhaps especially while talking about diversity. From my way of thinking, and we talked about this before, that what's really important from the point of view of liberal education is to understand oneself and

> understand self as it is represented in other persons. I think that's really at the bottom of what we're about.(Senior Social Sciences Faculty)

These faculty reason that it is the mission of the liberal arts college to present students with the conditions and opportunities for critical thinking especially if they challenge disciplinary conventions. These faculty articulate a view of liberal education as evolving and emergent, not narrow and doctrinaire.

Autonomy and Authority

Whether commenting on the value of multiculturalism or the value of a more racially and ethnically diverse faculty, the observations of faculty interviewed at Belden College repeatedly include reference to the distribution of authority at the college, in particular a perceived shift of institutional decision-making power from the faculty to the administration and trustees. Like many small liberal arts colleges, Belden College has maintained the tradition of faculty governance, historically conferring on the faculty control over curricular issues and faculty hiring. The administrative leaders of the college, long a group of former Belden faculty or at minimum former faculty from another liberal arts college, are now career administrators with little connection to the culture of the small liberal arts college and are consequently perceived to be antipathetic strangers.

The faculty we interviewed all hold the administration responsible to one degree or another, for good or bad, for the state of multiculturalism and "diversity" on the Belden campus. Faculty in our sample charge the administration, and in particular Belden's third year president, with acting in an authoritarian and bureaucratic manner to implement "diversity" projects summarily ignoring faculty governance and the culture

and history of shared responsibility. Whether or not faculty agree that multiculturalism and "diversity" is a mission of the institution, it is clear from their observations that faculty are suspicious and distrustful of administrative power to define and actuate such an objective. The Belden faculty in this sample, regardless of their feelings about the place and role of multiculturalism in liberal educational pedagogy, ultimately hold fast to the tradition of guild autonomy that includes the responsibility for the curriculum and teaching methods. Further, among some faculty there is resentment expressed over the affront to faculty integrity and vocation by lauding monetary rewards for actions taken in accordance to administrative "diversity" initiatives. For some faculty, 'being bought' offended their professorial honor.

We organized these sentiments and perceptions of accountability and autonomy around four sub-themes, (a) top-down/bureaucratic behaviors, (b) multiculturalism as the prerogative of the faculty, (c) character of administrative leadership and (d) causes of multicultural change.

The comments of faculty interviewed for this research project often reflect contempt for what they perceived to be a breach of the tradition of faculty governance. Throughout these interviews, faculty make clear their distaste for administrative leadership they view as autocratic and cavalier. Faculty comments are peppered with suspicion of administrative authority over faculty, authority that is perceived anchored to financial resources that determined key interrelated faculty concerns: the constitution of the faculty and the composition of the curriculum. Faculty speak of the administration's hold on the college's "purse strings" and the administration's attempts to tie funding to certain initiatives without the consultation and benediction of the faculty. Some faculty

feel baited to participate in "diversity" initiatives. Other faculty expressed heartfelt concern over what they perceive to be the death of faculty autonomy and authority and the ascendance of corporate or "business" values at the college. As one senior sciences faculty member states,

> one of my missions at the moment is to object to the administration trying to use its purse strings to control what faculty do…I have been, in various ways, refusing to cooperate on principle.

In particular, faculty view presidential and trustee decision-making in the area of multiculturalism and diversity as direct challenges to faculty autonomy and an undercutting of their expertise in and knowledge of academic matters. For example, administrative initiatives to diversify the faculty and the curriculum are perceived as ill conceived largely because faculty feel that these initiatives are superficial remedies for a complex and contested intellectual terrain. For example, the president's faculty diversity initiative is perceived to be about "visible" or "affirmative action" racial diversity and not critical, ideological diversification of the curriculum.

> …it seems clear, or the message that I've gotten is that they're [the administration and trustees] most interested in African-American hires…they would be satisfied or happy if they also got Latinos or Latinas or Asian Americans. (Senior Social Sciences Faculty)
>
> [The administration's] notions of multiculturalism are so narrow that they have confused I think multiculturalism with a certain affirmative action/reparations for sins of the past. None of which I object to, but there are different ways of considering what you're doing from an educational perspective. I mean, you

> know, we had a Southeast Asian American [faculty candidate], but he doesn't count. The fact that he was probably the best teacher of the lot didn't matter. Southeast Asians were out. (Senior Humanities Faculty)

Those interviewed view this faculty "diversity" initiative as simply a way to add to the number of non-Anglo faculty. Departments have had to make a case to the administration for such a hire, a move perceived as a violation of collegiality and community ethos. Departments were pitted against one another, each having to plead their case time and time again.

> [The administration] made it so bloody difficult. And that it wasn't just a position that a department would hire. It had to be approved by an administrative committee, by the executive council. The president was involved. So that at one point the dean asked me to write a justification for considering someone which was the third extended piece of writing I had to do in a matter of three weeks about candidates. (Senior Humanities Faculty)

Viewed as a carrot --a commitment to hire a faculty of color in exchange for a new departmental slot--many faculty interviewed voice concern about the administration's tactics to diversify their ranks. On a small campus that has historically valued a communal ethics, such an initiative smacks of a worldliness and competitive spirit that to this faculty belongs in the business sector and not in the cloistered world of the liberal arts college.

Because Belden's faculty believe that the composition of the curriculum is their central charge, they express concern that the administration's curricular "diversity" initiatives would challenge the integrity of liberal education at the college. Whether

individuals believe that the "diversification" of course content or curricular offerings are ultimately beneficial for learning or are intellectually suspect, there is consensus among those interviewed that any and all claims made on the curriculum are the prerogative of the faculty. Even if new "diversity" hires brought to the curriculum a change in content or subject matter, the purview of departments and faculty curricular governance committees could still render such change ineffective. These courses could be viewed as additive and superfluous rather than as substantive curricular transformation. Additionally, monetary incentives offered to faculty to add "diversity" units to existing courses or to revise existing courses still depend on individual faculty interest to be utilized, a condition complicated by many inter-related factors such as tenure status, disciplinary training and epistemological standpoint.

Despite the faculty's expressed anxiety and unease over the imposition of "diversity" initiatives by Belden's administration and trustees, there is a desire among those interviewed for unambiguous and principled leadership on multicultural issues. Faculty simultaneously deride the top-down authoritative management style of the current administration and demand exemplary leadership on "diversity" issues. For example, one senior humanities professor notes that "every hire the president made...has been a less-than-forty-year-old white man". She further explains that such actions lend to the faculty's suspicion of the integrity and value of the president's "diversity" initiatives. The president's inability to model the intention of his "diversity" directives to the faculty clearly signal to faculty that these initiatives are spurious and worthy of their distrust.

In their comments faculty also lament the lack of a communal conversation about the meaning, institutional worth, and implications of multiculturalism and "diversity", an

absence these faculty attributed to dubious leadership. Because Belden's faculty are so tied to the tradition of faculty governance, presidential leadership can only be effective if it is perceived to be representative of faculty needs and faculty views. In other words, in order to be effective presidential leadership at Belden must take account of faculty positions, ideas, and opinions. For these faculty, on the subject of multiculturalism and "diversity", this means that the president must facilitate and guide a public dialogue about the meaning and effects of such initiatives. The Belden faculty interviewed, regardless of epistemological position, all articulate confusion about the meaning and purposes of initiatives and speak to the need for an explicit, self-evident policy statement the result of community discussion. They want their president to be the conduit and coordinator for their communal commitments, not a detached and autocratic bureaucrat. In these faculty's view, Belden's president should champion their multicultural ventures; he or she should not be in competition with them.

The interviews with Belden faculty also reveal that most faculty do not view existing "diversity" or multicultural change as a consequence of presidential leadership. Instead, they cite such things as external or societal forces affecting the college, the internationalization of the student body and the curriculum, individual faculty initiative largely a consequence of graduate training and epistemological perspectives, and student demands. Faculty, with the exception of a former administrator, do not credit current or previous leadership for any positive multicultural or "diversity" improvement. It is also important to note that when commenting on multicultural change and leadership, faculty do not make any direct connection between multiculturalism and pedagogy other than equating increasing numbers of students of color with the need to attend to differing

learning styles. In general faculty say little about the relationship between leadership, curricular change and pedagogy.

Learning Style

At Belden, a dedication to teaching is an expectation for all faculty. This dedication includes utilizing changes and innovation in the classroom to improve the learning experience for the students. As the faculty and administration reflect on the classroom changes they have both enacted in their own classrooms and witnessed in others', they talk about a move away from traditional approaches to more interactive and hands-on methods. Professors discuss using group learning, increased discussion in class, and alternative means of presentation of materials.

In many cases, these teaching changes are aimed at reaching students with different learning styles. Often the students understood as having different learning styles are claimed to be non-traditional, usually signifying non-white students. Because the changes being made are assumed to make a class more beneficial for students of color, the course is then assumed to be more multicultural. A professor states, "the multiculturalism... is in trying alternative pedagogical styles to try to meet the needs of as many different students" (Senior Science Professor). This understanding of multiculturalism puts forth the belief that alternative teaching methods alone can make a course multicultural. This is a belief expressed at the individual, department, divisional, and administrative levels and plays a central role in the definition of and dedication to multiculturalism at Belden.

The story of the presence of teaching methods alone is best illustrated through the example of one specific program at Belden. The faculty and administration most often

cited and held up as a multicultural success the "Alternative Sciences Endeavor". This project was created to make the sciences more accessible to non-traditional science students. As one administrator describes,

> Introductory to Science classes have moved quite a bit, in the last five to ten years, towards a workshop model. Where, instead of having a lecture and a lab, we merged those and have the students doing hands on and interaction with the teacher. And that was something that was developed specifically because of different learning styles and specifically because of students from groups under represented in the sciences, struggling with having a lecture over here, and the lab over there. And many of these things which were developed as part of the [alternative sciences endeavor] encourage under represented groups to have better representation in sciences. (Administrator)

Here, the change in teaching methods came about as the student of color enrollment increased in the science courses. Along with the increased enrollment came an increase in students of color expressing interest upon entrance to Belden in becoming a science major. However, despite the increased interest and the increased enrollment, the actual number of science majors who were students of color decreased. A change in teaching methods was explored to make the courses more attractive and accessible to students of color, which is assumed to make the courses more multicultural, and thereby increasing the numbers of graduating science majors of color. Yet, while these teaching methods were being redesigned, the content of the courses were never re-examined to present the courses through a multicultural lens. Content rarely if ever ventures to include the context of identity or the bias and impact of the point of view of the

researcher in the sciences. Challenges to traditional course content and understandings of science do not yet have a place in the Alternative Sciences Endeavor.

Two factors of success of the Alternative Sciences Endeavor have thus far shielded it from scrutiny on multicultural content and even further necessary questioning on the epistemological multicultural grounding of the project. First, the Alternative Sciences Project is viewed as a multicultural success because the numbers of science majors of color persisting to graduation is on the rise. Second, according to the faculty the change in teaching methods alone is viewed as successful for all students enrolled in science classes. According to the faculty, teaching methods changes have increased student involvement, student satisfaction, and student learning.

> Then they found…what do you know? It works better for everyone…there was something that is developed to help a group that is perceived to be either struggling and then it turns out that, yes, there are also some things that are just really good things to discover and develop. And they seem to work for a wide group. (Administrator)

While the general improvement of the experience of both students of color and traditional science students appears an important improvement, it is unclear how it is making the sciences more multicultural except by enumerative measures. These statistics and general approval of the program restricts the ability of the Belden community to ask if this success is multicultural pedagogy or simply pedagogy that seeks to increase diversity of students within traditional courses.

Enumerative Diversity

When faculty and administrators speak about multicultural community and diversity efforts, they are most often referring to the desires of the college to increase both its student and faculty of color populations. In some cases individuals express an understanding of the increases as the terminal goal of multiculturalism at Belden. "[T]he college looks at it to some extent in terms of recruiting students and recruiting faculty and we need to have a certain amount of diversity" (Senior Humanities Faculty). Others view these increase attempts as a means to one of three ends.

First, it is the perception of many faculty that it is necessary to have students of color in the classroom because these students are able to present the unique perspectives of experiential difference. In describing one of his classes where the presence of students of color plays a significant role, one senior social science professor states, " I think [these courses are] eye opening and therefore, I think, it creates that opportunity for students to interact and to learn about cultures different from their own and in some sense, engage with those cultures". Another senior science professor echoes this perspective stating,

> those other students [students of color] are the ones who really probably had the biggest impact on what you got out of your education and that whole experience. And so, again, going back to the multiculturalism thing, that's one of the other motivations I think for institutions like [Belden] to have as diverse a student body as possible.

Under these assumptions, the way for experiential difference to be presented in the classroom is with the existence of students of color. The responsibility of these presentations of experiential difference and the resulting multicultural education of the traditional students rests in the hands and voices of the students of color.

The second end that is conveyed by the Belden faculty and administrators is an understanding of the enumerative diversity initiatives as an attempt to increase representation and ultimately create a critical mass of individuals of color in the student body and the faculty. This critical mass is believed to be necessary, otherwise undue burden is placed on the individuals of color. Many faculty express apprehension at asking a student of color to speak for the group and believe that a critical mass of students of color can avoid this problem. As a professor describes his classroom experiences at Belden,

> The percentage of students of color in class is low. There's always a problem of tokens and not wanting to represent the group and that's a problem. That's a problem for all us I think here. But it's in some of our classes probably somewhat less of problem because there's a bigger group of students of color. (Senior Social Science Faculty)

These assumptions demonstrate the belief that the most important factor in creating multicultural learning at Belden is the presence of diverse students. It is also understood that increasing the representation of faculty of color is necessary to achieve multicultural learning. Because individual faculty of color shoulders much of the multicultural load, creating a critical mass will allow multicultural change to be a possibility for Belden.

Finally, many faculty at Belden understand the efforts to increase the diversity of the institution as a way to introduce non-traditional educational perspectives and epistemologies. As one junior faculty member expresses,

> The college's policy of trying to create that diversity by targeting students and faculty -- by targeting recruitment of students and faculty of ethnic, of different

> ethnic backgrounds, I think is aimed at a sort of proxy. (Junior Humanities Faculty)

The assumption being made by many faculty and administrators is that an individual's race or ethnicity naturally determines their perspective and epistemology. This belief is illustrated through the president's faculty diversity initiative. This initiative, the major effort addressing multiculturalism and diversity at Belden this past year, has been a targeted recruitment program of only faculty of color. This attempt to diversify the faculty underscores the administrations' belief that the most effective way to address multiculturalism is to introduce faculty of color who must then (naturally) introduce non-traditional perspective into the classroom and the community. Across the faculty opinions vary greatly on the potential success of the initiative as well the soundness of the assumptions behind it.

Across all three of these ends a common belief emerges as central to Belden's understanding of multicultural change. The perceptions of faculty and administrators demonstrate an understanding that the other, specifically, non-whites, whether it is faculty or student, in the classroom or in community conversations, is the primary means to change.

Diversity as Enterprise

The faculty interviewed in this study often refer to the college's "diversity" initiatives as business ventures absent of or at odds with what they perceived to be liberal educational values. The faculty speak of concern for what they detected is a trumping of liberal educational values for the market concerns of higher education-as-business. They suggest that the college's "diversity" projects are reflective of the administration's and

trustee's "business" orientation, inclinations that pit the vocational core of the liberal arts college mission against the ends-driven, utilitarian nature of business enterprises. The faculty discerns this tension largely as a struggle between autocratic decision-making by administration and the tradition of faculty governance. It is this tension that pervades faculty perceptions of administrative initiatives designed to diversify faculty and student populations, and curricular offerings.

Faculty construe administrative "diversity" projects as reflective of a desire to create "view book diversity." Superficial and glossy, and designed to more competitively position the college in the marketplace for students, faculty, and outside funding, "diversity" projects were perceived by the faculty as a debasing of the college's central liberal educational mission. Such an aim, the practice of businesses and profit-making industries, is perceived as contradictory to the principles that established and guide the liberal arts college. One professor describes this dilemma stating, "I think the college's confusion about multiculturalism has what I call 'view book multiculturalism', does this person look multicultural enough to make our view book look interesting, versus multiculturalism as an intellectual project" (Senior Humanities Faculty).

This sense of view book diversity is underscored by the administration's desire to raise Belden's ranking, reputation and competitiveness. If the business of Belden College is to be successful, it must be able to demonstrate its diversity to prospective students. This will then place the institution in a more competitive niche. Faculty view these competitive desires as the driving force behind the administration's attention to multiculturalism. "I think people really do understand this, that excellent students are attracted to diverse colleges and that if we don't deal with diversity, we lose the excellent

students" (Junior Humanities Faculty). Because the diversity initiatives are understood in this way, the educative value of multiculturalism is ignored, and faculty express great skepticism about the effectiveness and worth of these initiatives.

Similar skepticism is expressed by the faculty regarding the administrative initiative to diversify the faculty. This endeavor is viewed as primarily enumeratively intentioned and narrowly focused, only taking into account the race of the applicants. Faculty recognize the planning and integration of these "diversity hires" as haphazard and peripheral to the fundamental goals of the curriculum and the institution. One professor describes the faculty perception of the initiative in the following way,

> Now the faculty doesn't speak with one voice, obviously, but the way I read the diversity initiative, was that it was a quick fix attempt to make a splashy change which would move this issue to the back burner for a while so that we can pursue other things, dealing with the financial goals of the college or the goals of the -- you know, the prestige goals of the college. (Senior Social Sciences Professor)

Ultimately, many faculty think the initiative will be unsuccessful because of its undeveloped and incompatible nature, because of how it is being carried out, and because the institution has done little to address its difficulty retaining faculty of color once they have been recruited and hired.

Another facet of the diversity as enterprise approach in administrative initiatives is through faculty development. Faculty development on diversity and multiculturalism is seen as a means to diversify the curriculum. Through the administrative use of funding, release time, and other incentives, faculty are encouraged to address their own courses as well as enter into dialogue and conversation with other professors on

multiculturalism. Again, the strength and utility of the faculty development programs are questioned as many professors view the initiatives as incoherent strategies and over-simplistic quick fixes to complex pedagogical issues. Additionally, to successfully enact faculty development for the diversification of the curriculum, individual faculty have to be willing to participate and have to be engaged in the process. This willingness is markedly diminished at Belden because faculty resent the interpretation of diversity as an enterprise and feel the administration should not have control of faculty development and its resulting curricular change.

Finally, the institutional presentation of diversity as enterprise substantiates the detrimental attitudes and beliefs held by some individuals at Belden that multiculturalism is academically and intellectually suspect, and is only given a place at Belden because of political correctness and white liberal guilt. Usually those who hold these beliefs understand multiculturalism as narrowly racial and costly to the quality of Belden's faculty. This is demonstrated by one professor's comments on the faculty diversity initiative, "You may have to realize that you will have to hire some people who may not, in other respects, be quite of the same standards that you would normally want to hire" (Senior Sciences Faculty). What results from these sentiments is further resistance and silence by these faculty to any diversity initiatives and multicultural change at Belden. Through the administration's furthering of the interpretation of diversity as enterprise they weaken their own efforts by repelling both those faculty who feel multiculturalism is essential to liberal education but this approach undermines its educational value, and those faculty who believe multiculturalism compromises educational value and that the entrepreneurial approach ignores this cost.

Conclusions and Implications

Conclusions and Implications

As a single institution case, this study reflects only the perceptions of the institutional participants and our evaluation of those perceptions. It would be improper to generalize from this one liberal arts college to all others which is of course not the aim of qualitative research. This, however, should not confuse the study's purpose and utility. It is our hope that through the examination of Belden College higher education researchers and practitioners can begin to relate our findings to other liberal arts campuses. In other words, this study of Belden College relates to campus initiatives that seek to address the impact of racial and ethnic heterogeneity on the college's teaching and learning emphasis. It is in identifying this relation that an institution's epistemological and cultural resemblance and kinship with Belden College can be functional. That as a model for institutional policy or faculty development or curricular reformation, the case of Belden College can help illustrate fundamental problems likely to be encountered by liberal arts colleges desiring multicultural community.

The findings of this study do expand and thicken the results from Martínez Alemán & Salkever (2001) and Martínez Alemán & Salkever (under review). The lack of coherence between institutional mission and multiculturalism, the absence of agreement of faculty and administration on the role of multiculturalism in liberal education, and the variety of epistemological positions characterize the climate at this liberal arts college struggling to attain pluralistic community. In particular, the findings from this study suggest that the nature of the institution's identity as perceived by these faculty is securely anchored to an assimilationist liberal education. Faculty perceptions

of pedagogy and multiculturalism reflect a concern for how multiculturalism disturbs the traditions of liberal educational pedagogy for good and for bad. Some faculty feel the disturbance is about compromising the integrity of liberal education, while others believe the disturbance signals a positive transformation of entrenched liberal learning. Regardless, and perhaps as a consequence of these differing epistemological positions that direct faculty views of the aims of multiculturalism in liberal education, multiculturalism has become the battleground for the struggle for faculty autonomy. As faculty battle to maintain autonomy, they do so at the expense of multicultural change.

From the interview data, we surmised that the relationship between multiculturalism and pedagogy is charged, tenuous, and oftentimes, dangerous. The essentialist view of race and ethnicity expressed by most faculty in relation to teaching and learning, though most often couched in a benevolent liberalism, is perilously close to being a "back door to eugenics" (Duster, 1990). Racial and ethnic difference in teaching and learning is for most of these faculty a matter of entertaining experiential difference and not a fundamental epistemological shift that engenders critical thinking in the classroom. This is an irony given the steadfast conviction that liberal education is a means to critical thinking (AAC&U, 1999), a belief held by these faculty.

Perhaps Belden College is a victim of its own neglect on this score. Unlike other institutions of higher education the multicultural agenda has come rather late to this campus (Levine, 1983). Perhaps the college's historic insularity, stability of its faculty, and relative constancy of its curriculum have made the college less amenable to postmodern and critical intellectual forces that provoke such change. However, the rise in interdisciplinary coursework at the college in the past twenty years, especially the

growth of women's studies, suggests that the curriculum and its pedagogy has to some degree moved beyond the proscriptions of liberal education. But then again, let's recall that the interdisciplinary programs at Belden, though popular with students, are institutionally marginalized as non-major programs. Consequently, their corresponding epistemologies have not been suffused into the larger liberal educational curriculum. It remains uncertain whether the whole of the Belden faculty reflects the growing sentiment of the nation's professorate that the Western canon and traditional pedagogies can no longer be privileged in our post-secondary classrooms (Sax, Astin, Korn & Gilmartin, 1999).

Our examination of the perceptions of Belden College faculty suggests that a more direct and formal assessment of their attitudes about multiculturalism and liberal education is necessary. If Belden College, like many of its peer residential, small liberal arts colleges, hopes to build pluralistic community through the work of its faculty--teaching and learning--it must assess the utility of faculty adherence to traditional liberal epistemologies. If faculty are ideologically positioned to insulate pedagogy from the effects of multiculturalism or an epistemology of difference, then Belden's quest for pluralistic community will continue to be frustrated.

References

American Council on Education (2000). Does diversity make a difference? Three research studies on diversity in college classrooms. Office of Minorities in Higher Education. On-line: http\\: www.acenet.edu.

Anderson, J. A. (1988). Cognitive styles and multicultural populations. Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (1), 2-9.

Angelo, T. A. & Cross. K. P. (1988). Classroom assessment techniques : a handbook for faculty . (Ann Arbor, MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.)

Association of American College and Universities (1995a). American commitments: Diversity, democracy and liberal learning. Washington, D. C.

Association of American College and Universities (1995b). American commitments: American pluralism and the college curriculum. Washington, D. C.

Association of American Colleges and Universities (1995c). American commitments: The drama of diversity and democracy. Washington, D. C.

Association of American Colleges and Universities (1999). Statement on liberal learning. Liberal Education, 85(2), 6-7.

Astin, A. W. (1993) What matters in college: Four critical years revisited. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass).

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 297-308.

Bandura, A. (986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall).

Banks, J. (1994). Dimensions of multicultural education. Insights on diversity. Kappa Delta Pi, 14-15.

Bender, T. & Schorske, C. E. (Eds.) (1997). American academic cultures in transformation. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Bensimon, E.M. (1995). Creating an institutional identity out of differences: A case study of multicultural organizational change. (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press).

Botstein, L. (1996). Thoughts on curriculum and change. In N. H. Farnham & A. Yarmolinsky (Eds.), Rethinking liberal education. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press).

Boyatzis, R.E. (1998). Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc).

Boyer, E. (1993). Campus climate in the 1980s and 1990s. In A. Levine (Ed.), Higher learning in America, 1980-2000. (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Boyer, E. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. (Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching).

Carnochan, W.B. (1993). The battleground of the curriculum: Liberal education and American experience. (Stanford, CA: Standford University Press).

Chickering, A. W. & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. AAHE Bulletin, 39(7), 3-7.

Clark, B. (1992). The distinctive college. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers).

Claxton, C. S. & Murrell, P. H. (1987). Learning styles: Their impact on teaching and administration. ASHE-ERIC Research Reports, 4. (Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education).

Cronon, W. (1999). Only connect: The goals of a liberal education. The American Scholar, 67(4), 73-80.

Davies, G. K.(1994) . The need for liberal education. New Directions for Higher Education; 85, 61-64.

Decker, B. (1983). Cultural diversity: Another element to recognize learning styles. NASSP Bulletin, 67.

Distinctively American: The Residential Liberal Arts Colleges (1999). Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 128 (1).

Duster, T. (1995). They're taking over! And other myths about race on campus. In Bérubé, M. & Nelson, C. (Eds.), Higher education under fire: Politics, economics, and the crisis of humanities (New York, NY: Routledge).

Duster, T. (1990). Backdoor to eugenics. (New York, NY: Routledge).

Eljamal, M.B., Sharp, S., Stark, J.S., Arnold, G.L., & Lowther, M.A. (1998). Listening for disciplinary differences in faculty goals for effective thinking. The Journal of General Education, 47(2), 117-148.

Feldman, K. A. & Newcomb, T. M. (1969). The impact of college on students. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass).

Feldman, K. A. (1994). Identifying exemplary teaching: Evidence form teacher evaluations. Paper commissioned by the National Center for Research to Improve

Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. (Stony Brook, NY: State University of New York at Stony Brook).

Feldman, K. A. (1989). The association between student ratings of specific instructional dimensions and student achievement: Refining and extending the synthesis of data from multisection validity studies. Research in Higher Education, 30, 583-645.

Franklin, J. & Theall, M. (1995). The relationship of disciplinary differences and the value of class preparation time to student ratings of teaching. In N. Hativa & M. Marincovich, M. (Eds). Disciplinary differences in teaching and learning: Implications for practice. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass), 41-48.

Gumport, P.J. (1988). Curricula as signposts of cultural change. Review of Higher Education, 12, (1), 49-61.

Gurin., P. (1999). Expert report of Patricia Gurin. *Gratz, et. al. v. Bollinger, et. al.*, No. 97-75321 (E.D. Mich.) and *Grutter, et. el. v. Bollinger, et. al.*, No. 97-75928 (E. D. Mich.) On-Line: http://www.umich.edu/urel/admissions/legal/expert/info.html

Haworth, J.G., & Conrad, C.F. (1995). Curricular transformation: Traditions and emerging voices in the academy. In J.G. Haworth and C.F. Conrad (Eds.), Revisioning curriculum in higher education. (Needham, MA: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing).

Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. (New York, NY: Wiley Publishers).

Hersh, R. H. (1997). The liberal arts college: The most practical and professional education for the twenty-first century. Liberal Education, 83(3), 26-33.

Hillard, A. (1989). Cultural style in teaching and learning. NEA Today, 7, 65-69.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Humphreys, D. (1997). General Education and the American commitments: A national report on diversity courses and requirements. (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities).

Humphreys, D. & Schneider, C.G. (1997). Curricular change gains momentum: New requirements focus on diversity and social responsibility. Diversity Digest. (On-line: http://www.inform.umd.edu/diversityweb/digest/w97).

Hunt, J.A., Bell, L.A., Wei, w., & Ingle, G. (1992). Monoculturalism to multiculturalism: Lessons from three public universities. In M. Adams (Ed.) Promoting diversity in college classrooms: Innovative responses for the curriculum, faculty, and institutions. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass).

Jenkins, C. A. & Bainer, D. L. (1991). Common instructional problems in the multicultural classroom. Journal of Excellence in College Teaching, 2, 77-88.

Koblik, S. (1999). Preface. Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 128 (1), v-xii.

Kolb, D.A. (1998). Learning styles and disciplinary differences. In K.A. Feldman and M.B. Paulsen, Teaching and learning in the college classroom, 2nd edition (Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster).

Kolb, D.A. (1976). Learning style inventory technical manual. (Boston, MA: McBern Company).

Krautman, A. C. & Sander, W. (1999). Grades and student evaluations of teachers. Economics of Education Review, 18 (1), 59-63.

Labare, M.J. & Lang, S.G. (1992) Institutional transformation for multicultural education: Bloomfield College and St. Norbert College. In M. Adams (Ed.) Promoting

diversity in college classrooms: Innovative responses for the curriculum, faculty, and institutions. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass).

Levine, A. (1983). Diversity on campus. In A. Levine (Ed.), Higher learning in America: 1980-2000 (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press).

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. (Newbury Park, CA: Sage).

Longstreet, W. (1994). Understanding ethnicity. Insights on diversity. Kappa Delta Pi, 14-15.

Maher, F.A. & Tetrault, M.K.T. (1994). The feminist classroom. (New York, NY: Basic Books).

Marchesani, L.S. & Adams, M. (1992). Dynamics of diversity in the teaching-learning process: A faculty development model for analysis and action. In M. Adams (Ed.) Promoting diversity in college classrooms: Innovative responses for the curriculum, faculty, and institutions. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass).

Martínez Alemán, A. M. (2001). Community, higher education and the challenge of multiculturalism. Teachers College Record, 103 (3), 485-503.

Martínez Alemán, A. M. & Salkever, K. (2001). Multiculturalism and the mission of liberal education. Journal of General Education, 20 (1), 102-139.

Martínez Alemán, A. M. & Salkever, K. (In Press). Mission, multiculturalism, and the liberal arts college: A qualitative investigation. The Journal of Higher Education.

McKeachie, W. J., Pintrich, P. R., Lin, Y., & Smith, D. (1986). Teaching and learning in the college classroom: A review of the research literature. National Center for

Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press).

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. (Beverly Hills, CA : Sage Publications).

Murray, H.G. & Renaud, R.D. (1995). Disciplinary differences in classroom reaching behaviors. . In N. Hativa & M. Marincovich, M. (Eds). Disciplinary differences in teaching and learning: Implications for practice. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass), 31-40.

Newman, J. H. (1999/1852). The idea of a university. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

Nussbaum, M. (1997). Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Pascarella, E. T. & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass).

Pascarella, E. T. (1980). Student-faculty informal contact and college outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 50, 545-595.

Patton, M. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods, 2nd edition. (Newbury Park, CA: Sage).

Salkever, K. (2002). Curriculum at the crossroads: Multiculturalism and liberal arts education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA.

Sax, L., Astin, A.W., Korn, W.S. & Gilmartin, S.K. (1999). The American college teacher: National norms for the 1998-99 HERI faculty survey. (Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, Inc.).

Stage, F.K., Muller, P.A., Kinzie, J., & Simmons, A. (1998). Creating learning centered classrooms: What does learning theory have to say? ASHE-ERIC Higher education Report, 26(4), (Washington, D.C: The George Washington University).

Schuster, M. & Van Dyne, S. (1984). Placing women in the liberal arts: Stages of curriculum transformation. Harvard Educational Review, 54, (4), 413-428.

Sims, E. R. & Sims, S. J. (Eds.) (1995). The importance of learning styles: Understanding the implications for learning, course design, and education. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press).

Smart, J.C. & Ethington, C.A. (1995). Disciplinary and institutional differences in undergraduate educational goals. In N. Hativa & M. Marincovich, M. (Eds). Disciplinary differences in teaching and learning: Implications for practice. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass), 49-58.

Smith, D. G & Associates. (1997) Diversity works: The emerging picture of how students benefit. (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities).

Stark, J.S. & Morstain, B.R. (1978). Educational orientations of faculty in liberal arts colleges: An analysis of disciplinary differences. Journal of Higher Education, 49(5),420-437.

Teaching What We Do: Essays by Amherst College Faculty. (1991). (Amherst, MA: Amherst College Press).

Tsui, L. (1999). Courses and instruction affecting critical thinking. Research in Higher Education, 40 (2), 185-200.

Wagener, U.E. (1991). Changing the culture of teaching: Mathematics at Indiana, Chicago, and Harvard. Change, 23 (4), 28-37.

Whitehead, A. N. (1929). The aims of education, and other essays. (New York, NY: Macmillan).

Willis, M. G. (1989). Learning styles of African American children: A review of the literature and interventions. Journal of Black Psychology, 16(1), 47-65.

Wong, F. F. (1996). Search for liberal education. In N. H. Farnham & A. Yarmolinsky (Eds.), Rethinking liberal education (New York, NY: Oxford University Press), 63-76.

Appendix A
FACULTY & ADMINISTRATION
Sample Interview Protocol

A. General questions that may be used to initiate the interview and set the tone and mood for a thoughtful session of inquiry. Background questions:

1. Can you describe your position at the college?

2. How long have you been here at the college?

3. Have you worked at another institution? Compare these institutions?

B. Research Project's Specifics

1. Review using the language of the letter and consent form. Stress confidentiality. Provide option to end interview at any time or to refuse to answer specific questions.

2. Review the purposes of the project.

3. How do you define multiculturalism? How do you think the college defines it?

C. The Current State of the Pedagogy and Curriculum

1. Let's talk about the curriculum at this college. Does the curriculum encourage or inhibit opportunity for students to communicate with those different than them. Can you give an example of what this might look like in a classroom?

2. How are students being asked to scrutinize the experiences of others unlike them in class?

3. In what ways does pedagogy ask students to do these things?

4. How does/does not pedagogy get at critical scrutiny and individual interests?

5. What is the role of formal initiatives on pedagogy and multiculturalism?

6. How does the college give faculty the opportunity to engage in the development of courses and pedagogy that involve multicultural subject matter?

7. How has curricular offerings changed in the time you have worked at this institution? What has been the impetus for these changes? Can you cite some examples of relatively new courses that have been offered?

8. Talk about pedagogical changes accompanying curricular changes.

E. Fit of Multiculturalism in the Pedagogical and Curricular Goals of Liberal Arts Education Goals

9. I am interested in hearing your thoughts on how liberal education depends on the scrutiny of difference. Does the scrutiny of difference fit within the mission of this liberal arts college? How? How does the curriculum reflect this?

10. Does diversity impact learning at the college? How?

11. Does liberal education here include a belief that the students' intellectual and developmental growth is dependent on the growth other students? How? Can you give examples?

12. Does the college believe that multiculturalism in the curriculum is good? If so what is your perception of what good mean? How is it articulated to individuals in the college community?